

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated February 9, 2004. Applicant has amended several claims to clarify key features of the invention and overcome the claim rejections. Applicant has further amended other claims that were conditionally allowed to place these claims in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

At paragraph 4 of the present Office Action, Examiner states that 4-19, 22-24 and 29-35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Examiner specifically states which features of the claims are allowable in his statements of reasons.

Using these statements of reasons as a guide, Applicant has rewritten Claim 4 as an independent claim, incorporating those features of the independent and intervening claims required for allowability. Applicant has also incorporated the allowable subject matter from dependent claims 22 and 29 into their respective independent Claims 20 and 28. The incorporation of the allowable subject matter makes the independent claims and thus all claims dependent thereon allowable.

Finally, with respect to independent Claim 1 and claims dependent thereon (i.e., Claims 9-19), Applicant has amended that claim and provides arguments below in support of extending the allowance to cover these claims as well. Notably, Claims 9-19 are also independently allowable.

Given the above amendments, all claims are now in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests Examiner extend the allowance to cover all pending claims and issue a Notice of Allowance.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-3, 20, 21 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hegleson, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,652). *Hegleson* does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention because *Hegleson* does not teach each feature recited by Applicant's claims.

Applicant's claims are directed to a computer-based design framework for use by dispersed designed teams that required access to and interaction with each other. Applicant's claims recite the following: (1) "a virtual database management system, which receives data from a plurality of distinct sources that are involved in the collaborative design of a product and creates a single database interface to said sources" (Claim 1); "each of said distinct sources represents a design team with one or more design team members provided access to said virtual database management system via a network" (Claim 2); and (3) "program code for providing platform-independent application and services exchange for collaborative efforts of each design team utilizing XML wrapped data, service, and application that is delivered to a client" (Claim 3) (emphases added).

It is clear from these claim features that the concept of a design team accessing a single design framework is a key component of Applicant's claimed invention. *Hegleson* does not teach (or even suggest) this feature. The cited sections of *Hegleson* (e.g., col. 111-112 and col. 115-118) are clearly devoid of this feature and do not contemplate a design team collaboration, which is the focus of the claimed invention.


The standard for a § 102 rejection requires that the reference teach each element recited in the claims set forth within the invention. As clearly outlined above, *Hegleson* fails to meet this standard and therefore does not anticipate Applicant's invention.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has diligently responded to the Office Action by clarifying features of rejected claims to overcome the 102 rejections and by amending the other claims to place the claims in condition for allowance. The amendments and arguments together overcome the §102 rejection, and Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicant further respectfully requests the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Isidore', written over a horizontal line.

Eustace P. Isidore

Registered with Limited Recognition (see attached)

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Highway

Suite 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)




**BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

LIMITED RECOGNITION UNDER 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

Mr. Eustace P. Isadore is hereby given limited recognition under 37 CFR §10.9(b) as an employee of Dillon & Yudell L.L.P. to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the patent applicant is the client of Dillon & Yudell L.L.P., and the attorney or agent of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Dillon & Yudell L.L.P. This limited recognition shall expire on the date appearing below, or when whichever of the following events first occurs prior to the date appearing below: (i) Mr. Eustace P. Isadore ceases to lawfully reside in the United States, (ii) Mr. Eustace P. Isadore's employment with Dillon & Yudell L.L.P. ceases or is terminated, or (iii) Mr. Eustace P. Isadore's current Employment Authorization card expires.

This document constitutes proof of such recognition. The original of this document is on file in the Office of Enrollment and Discipline of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Expires: June 26, 2004



Harry I. Moatz
Director of Enrollment and Discipline

RECEIVED

JUN 08 2004

Technology Center 2100